

Does Abortion Trump Everything Else?

(August 21, 2020)

Have you ever had someone say that you're a one issue voter? That you're just pro-life on the abortion issue, but you're not pro-life on so many other issues like poverty, like health insurance, like racism, like climate change, capital punishment, and some other issues? That if you want to be pro-life, you have to be pro-life after people are born, as well. Not just when they become born you give up on them; that's what you pro-life people do. You're just pro-life for the unborn, you're not pro-life for anybody else.

Is that really true? And are the issues equal morally? Are they morally equivalent issues? A friend of mine, who happens to be a pastor, sent me an article by Ron Sider. I don't know if you've heard of Ron Sider. Ron Sider is an evangelical but he's more liberal politically. He's about 80 years old now. I think he teaches at Eastern College in Pennsylvania. I don't know if Tony Campolo is still there. You may have heard the name Tony Campolo. Tony Campolo is a brilliant speaker, but he's very left politically. He teaches there, as well. Anyway, this article that Ron Sider wrote, that a pastor friend of mine sent me was, Does Abortion Trump Everything Else. Very good title, I think. Does Abortion Trump Everything Else? And I want to go through this article, because when you read it, you go, you know, he's making some good points here. But I think when you get under the covers of this you realize that things are not what they seem; that he's failing to make some distinctions.

So, let me just start out with his article. It's on his website. And again, his name is Ron Sider. If you look it up, Does Abortion Trump Everything Else, you can read the entire article. It'll be very instructive to think through what he says and consider what he says. Here's how he starts his article of August 17.

"I believe abortion should be grieved, not celebrated; discouraged not promoted. I was glad to see the recent statement of Democrats for Life urging the Democratic Party to be more welcoming of them. Decades ago, I wrote a book called COMPLETELY PRO-LIFE and I recently

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

published an Op Ed in USA Today criticizing Joe Biden and the Democratic Party's current position on abortion.

But does abortion trump (sorry, but that is the shortest way to ask my question) ,does abortion trump all other issues? Some Evangelicals and Catholics think so. (I'm getting responses to my blogs from them!)

I disagree and here is why.

Over the course of my life, I have had good Christian friends who said: The overriding political issue is nuclear weapons. Or global poverty. Or marriage. Or abortion. I have always said, "I care about that issue. But what does the Bible say God cares about?"

When we ask that question, it quickly becomes clear that God cares both about the sanctity of human life and economic justice for all, especially the poor. God cares both about marriage and racial justice. God cares both about sexual integrity and peacemaking and care for creation.

That is why the National Association of Evangelicals (the largest evangelical network in the United States) says in its official public policy document (FOR THE HEALTH OF THE NATION) that "faithful evangelical civic engagement and witness must champion a biblically balanced agenda" (page 12). And this official document goes on to illustrate what a "biblically balanced agenda" includes. The document has eight major sections: 1), protecting religious freedom and liberty of conscience; 2) safeguarding the nature and sanctity of human life; 3) strengthening marriage, families and children ; 4) seeking justice and compassion for the poor and vulnerable; 5) preserving human rights; 6) pursuing racial justice and reconciliation; 7) promoting just peace and restraining violence; 8) caring for God's creation."

Now this all sounds good and I would agree that these are good priorities for a political party to pursue. But the devil here is in the details. And I say think as Dr. Sider goes on in his article, he fails to make several distinctions. Number one, he fails to understand moral hierarchy, that's number one. Number two, he fails to understand the purpose of government, the primary purpose. Number three, he fails to understand ends and means distinctions. And number four, he fails to anticipate unintended consequences, or what we might say is, the ripple effect. And

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

finally, number five, he fails to read the Bible. Because here's the very next sentence in his article. "This official evangelical document clearly says all these issues are important. It does not say one issue is more important than all the others. They are all crucially parts of a biblically balanced political agenda."

Okay. Notice that his official document is not the Bible, but a statement by an evangelical political group that has become more liberal in recent years. In fact, he doesn't even quote the Bible at all in this article. Not once. Now, you might give him some grace here and say, okay, he's trying to summarize a lot in a short period of time. It's just a column, he can't go into all the details. Okay, we'll let him go on that. But there's still a problem here, and the problem is, he fails to understand a moral hierarchy here.

Here's how he continues. He says this. "One wag (unkindly) suggested that some "pro-life" people seem to care about the sanctity of human life only from "conception to birth." But if one is truly pro-life, one must care about the sanctity of human life from conception to natural death. There are many things that public policy shapes that kill persons created in the image of God. That includes global poverty, lack of health insurance, racism, smoking, climate change and capital punishment."

Okay, now he's going to go through each one of these, and we'll go through them with him and evaluate what he says according to the Scriptures and according to good reason. But let's just point out one thing. As we start this, I just want to ask you this question. Because he puts all these things together as if they're all equal in terms of priority. Here's my question. Is failing to give money to a poor person just as bad as murdering a poor person? Is failing to give money to a poor person just as bad as murdering a poor person?

I think common sense, and as we look here in the scriptures, as well, tells us no. They're not the same. There's a moral hierarchy going on. If I fail to give a homeless person on the street \$10 would that be just as bad as shooting him? Of course not. But that's what Dr. Sider seems to be saying here. He's saying that they're all equal. There's no priority here.

Now is a candidate that is against a government program, allegedly to help the poor, just as bad as a candidate being for a government program that funds the killing of the poor? Well, of

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

course not. And that's actually what's going on. In our country, there's an entire party that wants to use taxpayer money to kill innocent people through abortion. And would Dr. Sider say that, because another candidate who is pro-life on the abortion issue, because he doesn't support a particular government program that's supposed to help the poor, that these are equivalent moral issues? That these are equivalent morally? These positions are equivalent. No, of course they're not. But that's what this article seems to indicate.

So, his failure to understand that there is a moral hierarchy is the biggest problem, I think, in this article. That some moral actions are better or worse than others. This is called graded absolutism. My mentor, Dr. Norman Geisler, has written books on this. In fact, his book, *Christian Ethics*, goes into this. Here's what he says, the opening paragraph of a section on graded absolutism, that there is a hierarchy of moral duties. He says, "not all moral laws are of equal weight. Jesus spoke of weightier matters of the law in Matthew 23:23. And the least of these, Matthew 5:19. And the greatest commandment, Matthew 22:36. He told Pilate that Judas had committed the greater sin, John 19:11."

He goes on and on and talks about the fact that there is a moral hierarchy out there. And when you think about this, the right to life is the right to all other rights. If you don't have life, you don't have anything. And to suggest that murdering people is the moral equivalent of not, say, giving them a government program just makes absolutely no sense, according to Jesus, or natural law, or basic common sense. And we'll go further on this in just a minute. You're listening to, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, with Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. The website is crossexamined.org. Back in just two minutes.

Ad: Friends, can you help me with something? Can you go up to iTunes, or wherever you listen to this podcast, and give us a five-star review Why? It will help more people see this podcast and, therefore, then hear it. So, if you could help us out there, I'd greatly appreciate it.

Does Abortion Trump Everything Else? That's the question we're investigating today, especially when it comes to who you support politically, or what party you support, or what priorities you support. We're going through an article written by Ron Sider, an evangelical scholar, who is a little bit left in his political viewpoint. And we're analyzing his article called, *Does Abortion Trump Everything Else?* we are in an election season now. We're within just a couple of months

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

to the election. So, these are the kind of issues that we're talking about here today. And we were pointing out just before the break that there is a hierarchy in the bible, and in moral common sense, that some sins are worse than other sins. That some meritorious actions are better than other meritorious actions. In fact, Jesus said, there's no greater love than to give your life for your friends. Okay, that's a greater moral action than, say, just helping somebody across the street, as we might say. In fact, in heaven, there will be different levels of reward for moral actions done here on Earth. And there will be, in hell, different levels of punishment for different immoral actions conducted here on Earth. This just makes sense from a justice perspective. And it appears that Dr. Sider doesn't get that distinction.

So, we pointed out just before the break, there's a moral hierarchy. The right to life is the right to all other rights. And to give you another example of graded absolutism, this is applied even during, what we might say, are moral dilemmas. You know, if you're in Nazi Germany in World War Two, and you're hiding Jews in your attic, and you get a knock at the door...schnell, schell...schnell, schnell. You come to the door, there are Nazi guards. Hast du hier Juden? What do you say? Well, you're not supposed to lie, right? Yeah, we got some Jews up in the attic right now. In fact, there's four of them up there. If you only see three, make sure you keep looking. No. You lie to protect innocent life. Why? Because there's a hierarchy of absolutes. And when you run into a conflict, you are exempted from the lower absolute to always tell the truth so you can fulfill the greater absolute, which is to protect innocent life. You have a greater duty to protect innocent life than you do to tell the truth to a guilty murderer.

Should you give your neighbor his property? Of course, you should. But what if his property is his car keys and he's drunk? No, at that point, you say no, I have a higher moral duty to protect my neighbor and anybody who might hurt if he gets in his car and drives, than I have to give him his property right now. There's a hierarchy in morality.

And Jesus pointed this out, ironically, for Dr. Sider, who doesn't appear to know about this interaction, or at least didn't highlight it in his article. Jesus is talking to the politicians of his day in Matthew, chapter 23, the Pharisees, they were the politicians. Some of them were on the Sanhedrin, the Jewish ruling council, the very same Jewish ruling council that sent Jesus to die. They were sort of the Israeli Supreme Court and Rome delegated much of the government authority, much of the day to day running of Israel, to the Sanhedrin, particularly on religious

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

matters. And here's what Jesus says to them. Matthew 23:23-24...easy to remember. It's right in the middle of a stinging rebuke where Jesus, who was not always a nice guy, by the way, went after these hypocrites and here's what he says. "23 "Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You give a tenth of your spices—mint, dill and cumin. But you have neglected the more important matters of the law—justice, mercy and faithfulness. You should have practiced the latter, without neglecting the former. 24 You blind guides! You strain out a gnat but swallow a camel."

What's he saying here? There is a hierarchy. Sure, you should obey the lower moral precepts, you should you tithe your spices, but you should not neglect the weightier matters of the law. Justice, for example. And certainly, it is unjust to take the life of an innocent human being; an unborn child. In fact, you are neglecting the more important matters of the law if you think failing to give money to a poor person is the moral equivalent of murdering a poor person, which is what this article is trying to tell you. That all of these so called moral causes that Christians should be for, and we agree on the list that he said there generally, we may have quibbles over defining some of these, but we agree on the list that I mentioned earlier. But we don't agree that they're all the same morally, or they're all of the same priority.

In fact, the Lord, through Jeremiah, had a very stern warning for the people of Israel in Jeremiah chapter seven. Now what's the context of Jeremiah chapter seven? Well, Jeremiah, you know, is the weeping Prophet. He's trying to tell Judah, the southern kingdom, that unless they turn around morally, and they stop worshipping idols, they're going to be judged. And at this point, he knows they're going to be judged because they're, not only worshipping idols, they're sacrificing their children to Moloch, the Canaanite God. And here's what he says in Jeremiah chapter seven, beginning in verse 30. This is the warning the Prophet has for the people of Judah.

He says, "30 "The people of Judah have done evil in my eyes, declares the Lord. They have set up their detestable idols in the house that bears my Name and have defiled it." In other words, they were putting these idols actually in the temple. He goes on to say, "they have built the high places of Topheth"... What's Topheth? Topheth is from an Aramaic word, which means fireplace... "in the Valley of Ben Hinnom"... What is that? That's the valley to the south of the city of David, that we get the word Gehenna from, which literally means hell. It was a place

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

where they burned their garbage. You can go there today. I've been to this valley several times. It's just south of the city of David, which is just south of the current Old City of Jerusalem.

And here's what it says..."31 in the Valley of Ben Hinnom to burn their sons and daughters in the fire—something I did not command, nor did it enter my mind". In fact, God said, do not do this in Leviticus 18 and Leviticus 20, don't burn your children to Molech. He goes on to say, "32 So beware, the days are coming, declares the Lord, when people will no longer call it Topheth or the Valley of Ben Hinnom, but the Valley of Slaughter, for they will bury the dead in Topheth until there is no more room. 33 Then the carcasses of this people will become food for the birds and the wild animals, and there will be no one to frighten them away."

In other words, he's saying, you know you've murdered your children in this valley. You've murdered them, and now you will be murdered by the Babylonians, and your bodies will be thrown in this valley without burial, and the birds will feast on your flesh. He goes on to say, "34 I will bring an end to the sounds of joy and gladness and to the voices of bride and bridegroom in the towns of Judah and the streets of Jerusalem, for the land will become desolate."

That's from Jeremiah chapter seven. This is what God said would happen to Israel for worshipping idols and murdering their children. When will judgment come for us? Will he allow internal riots perhaps, or an external force to judge us? I don't know. I'm simply saying that God does not want us to kill our children, that this is a such a serious offense, idolatry and killing our children, murdering our children, that he judged the nation of Israel for this. And we're saying it's just the same as not reducing global emissions, which is what Ron Sider is going to tell us here in just a few minutes? That's a failure to understand that there's a moral hierarchy.

How about global poverty? This is what Dr. Sider says, "About 9 million people die every year of hunger and hunger related illnesses. Poor nutrition and hunger kill 3.1 million children every year. Bread for the World reports that over 800 million people suffer inadequate nourishment because of hunger. And because of inadequate nourishment, 200 million children under five are stunted — which produces permanent damage to body and brain. The World Food Program estimates that by the end of 2020, 265 million people around the world could be pushed to the brink of starvation. In our rich world, there is no need for millions of people to die of hunger. There are many effective programs that Americans contribute to — both private and

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

government programs — that are effective in reducing global poverty. But the Trump administration has repeatedly sought to cut government programs to combat global poverty. That is a pro-life issue."

Okay. It is a pro-life issue. I agree with that. However, I have a few questions. I think, first of all, this fails to understand what the purpose of government is. And let me ask this question. He mentions global poverty. Is the President of the United States responsible for solving global poverty? Is the President of the United States the president of the world? And if he is, if you think he is, does he have unlimited resources to solve global poverty? Or does he have to pick and choose among limited resources? Yeah. B. He does.

Now, I think the government should do what it can to solve poverty. But global poverty is not something that the United States is responsible for. We may obviously try and alleviate that but that's not his primary responsibility. His primary responsibility is to protect innocent people from being murdered. Sorry. But the democrats are not only failing to protect the unborn from murder, they want to pay for it. Look, I'm just telling you the truth here. You can do what you want with this information. But that's what's going on. The primary purpose of government is to protect innocent people from evil. It's not to alleviate poverty. Although governments can attempt to do so then that's a good thing. But it's not their primary responsibility.

Again, this is not only a failure to understand the purpose of government, it's a failure to understand a moral hierarchy. What is the purpose of government? Paul talks about it in Romans chapter 13. He says, "4 For the one in authority is God's servant for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for rulers do not bear the sword for no reason. They are God's servants, agents of wrath to bring punishment on the wrongdoer." The primary responsibility of government is to protect innocent people from evil and there is no greater evil than murder. The right to life is the right to all other rights. If you're going to kill people, the government needs to step in and stop you from doing that. And it's a double tragedy when the government itself is doing it. It's killing innocent people by funding it, which is what the government does, or the Democrat Party wants to do through abortion.

So, it's a failure to understand a moral hierarchy. It's a failure to understand the purpose of government. It's also a failure to understand the difference between ends and means. And let

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

me just be as charitable as I can, to both sides in our political debate. I honestly think that both parties want to help the poor. They just have different means of getting there. They agree on the ends. They disagree on the means. Now, we don't want to disagree over the ends. We all want to help the poor, because that's what God would want us to do, although it's not the primary role of God. But we can disagree on the means. We can look at what works and what doesn't work. And that's what we're going to talk about right after the break. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. Our website is crossexamined.org. We're back in two minutes.

Ad: If you find value in the content of this podcast, don't forget to follow us on Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter. Join our online community to have great conversations, grow in your knowledge of God and become a better defender of the Christian faith. Also, don't forget to subscribe to our YouTube channel, where we have hundreds of videos, and over 100,000 subscribers that are part of an online family. Find those by searching for Frank Turek or CrossExamined in the search bar. You can find many more resources like articles, online courses, free downloadable materials, event calendars, and more at crossexamined.org.

Welcome back to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with me, Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. We're talking about this article written by Ron Sider called, Does Abortion Trump Everything Else, when it comes to who you should support politically. He, obviously, is supporting Vice President Biden. And he's trying to make the case, anyway, that look, if you're pro-life, okay, the democrats have it wrong on abortion, but it balances out by all these other things. That's what we're talking about here. That's what his thesis is. And we're going through that thesis and pointing out what, I think, are some problems with his thesis.

And just before the break, he was talking about global poverty, and I was talking about there's a difference between ends and means. And I also mentioned that he doesn't quote the Bible at all in his article. And if you if you really look at the Bible, you realize there is a hierarchy of morality. There's there are certain things that are more moral than others. There are greater commandments and lesser commandments. There are greater sins and lesser sins. And so, that ought to be reflected in our politics.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

And by the way, if you've never been taught how to interpret your Bible, we're actually going to be teaching a new course starting September 7. If you take the premium version, you're going to be live online with me on six occasions to do live zooms, Q&A sessions. We're going to go through How to Interpret Your Bible. It's like 12 hours of video. It's an online course. If you just go to crossexamined.org, click on online courses, you can be a part of it. We're about two thirds full right now. We only take so many students. So, if you want to be a part of that sign up soon. Also, I'm going to teach, Why I Still Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. If you're a high school student, or a college student, or a parent of either, you can join that class. It's going to be a daytime class. We'll have 10 zoom sessions together. That begins on September 17. There are other courses that you can check out on crossexamined.org. Just go to online courses once you go there.

And I just think that, either Dr. Sider didn't know about these verses, or interpreted them improperly here, in my view anyway. And if you know these verses, if you know how the Bible works, if you know what Jesus is saying and how he goes after the politicians for their inverted priorities, then you will know that there is a moral hierarchy out there and everything is not morally equal. And if you think about it, ladies and gentlemen, in this country, we're telling people what light bulbs they can and can't use, but we're not telling people don't kill your children. We're allowing them to kill their children. And if the democrats have their way, they'll want the government, or really the taxpayer, to pay for killing children. Really, that's what's going on.

Now, let's go back to what he said about poverty. Dr. Sider said, but the Trump administration has repeatedly sought to cut government programs to combat global poverty. That is a pro-life issue. No specifics are given. What programs? Were they efficient programs? Was the food really getting to the poor? And is that the only way to help the poor? Generally, people on the left want to give government handouts. Generally, people on the right want to improve the economy for everybody because a rising tide lifts all boats. Now, of course, the people on the right have a safety net. But they think that too many people on the left are using the safety net as a hammock, where we're actually paying people not to work. That is a problem. Able bodied people not to work. We're paying people to have children out of wedlock. That's a problem that creates generational poverty. And it gives the poor children no father in the home, which is a

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

whole nother problem that leads to a bunch of other issues that are negative on the individuals and negative on society.

By the way, 20-30 years ago, when there was a great famine in Ethiopia, we kept sending food over there, but it never got to the poor. Why? Because warlords intercepted it, and then used it to buy weapons and feed themselves. So, not every program is a good program. Are there better ways of combating poverty? This is an ends and means distinction. Don't say that because somebody doesn't agree with your particular way of trying to help the poor that that person doesn't want to help the poor. That person may have a better way of helping the poor that isn't just a handout.

In fact, Marvin Olasky actually interviewed Dr. Sider last year. Marvin Olasky wrote a book called, *The Tragedy of American Compassion*, where he basically says, hey, look, if you just give people handouts that creates a problem. And actually, in this article, or in this interview, Dr. Sider agrees with him. He says, well, I think you talk about that in your *Tragedy of American Compassion* book and I think you're half right about that. You know, the side that you just talked about is really important.

Dr. Olasky had just pointed out, you know, private charity is a better way of doing this rather than just giving handouts. And here's what Sider says, "and I think it's better for private programs helping poor people to require work, some kind of contribution. It's better for their dignity, and it's better for their own sense of not falling into dependency." So, Dr. Sider actually agrees with what I just said. But you wouldn't think it by the article he just wrote, because he seems to say that if you don't agree with his way of combating poverty, and he's not specific here, other than saying it's a government program, that somehow, you're not trying to combat poverty. No, you are. And I think you are neglecting the more important matters of the law. If you think that if a candidate disagrees with your government program to supposedly help the poor, he's just as bad as a candidate who wants the government to pay to murder a million babies this year. That's the problem I don't think he's seen. He has a blind spot here.

Then he goes on to healthcare. Here's what he says. "The US is the only industrialized nation that does not guarantee health coverage to everyone". That's false, by the way. Everyone has health care. You can go to any emergency room and not be denied. It's the law. Now it's true,

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

not everyone has health insurance. And he goes on to say that, "studies have shown that people without health insurance are less likely to visit a doctor, more likely to have poor health, and die younger than persons with health insurance". He's probably right about that. "But the Trump administration has tried repeatedly to abolish the Affordable Care Act (which provided health insurance to about 20 million more Americans)—without offering a different program to provide health insurance to everyone. The is a pro-life issue."

Now, first of all, again, everybody has health care. Not everybody has health insurance. When Obamacare came in...I'm self-employed...you know what happened to my health insurance premium? My health insurance premium for my wife and I was \$1200 dollars a month. When Obamacare came in, it went to \$2400 a month. And one of the reasons it did that, because every plan was required to carry maternity coverage. Maternity coverage. We're 58 years old. We don't need maternity coverage. But no, when you get the government involved, things become inefficient. We couldn't afford that. We're now with Christian Healthcare Ministries. We pay like \$350 a month and we pay for everything up to \$500. You might want to check them out.

By the way, we don't have traditional health insurance anymore, because when you get the government involved, a lot more people can't afford it rather than can afford it. Now, this is a complicated issue. I don't want to make light of the fact that I've got it figured out. I don't. But I will say this, as Ben Shapiro has pointed out, he's made the point, there are three elements of health care and you can't have all three. You might be able to get two of the three, but not all three. What are the three elements? High quality, reasonable cost, universal coverage. You can't have all three of those. You're not going to have high quality, reasonable or low cost, and universal coverage. You gotta sacrifice one of those.

And here's another problem that I think is unseen. What is unseen is that there's a ripple effect that Dr. Sider fails to understand. It seems that if you try and give universal coverage, for example, and you cover all pre-existing conditions, and the price goes up, it has to go up. And if the price goes up, fewer people can afford it. So, it's a complicated issue and he makes it seem like it's just easy. Liberals seem to think that if you just pass a law for something to be so it will be so. That the realities of life, natural law and human nature, will just all change because

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

someone passes a law in Washington. If you want better health care at a lower cost, you got to reduce government involvement.

Think about the things that cost the most in society; health care, housing, and education. Why do they cost so much? Because the government is dramatically involved. The government's involved with regulations far too much in health care, housing, and education. You take choice away, price goes up, inefficiencies go up. You introduce competition, it gets better for everyone. And if you kill the golden goose of the US healthcare system, everyone across the world is going to suffer. Why? Because most of the innovations are done for here. Why? Because there's a profit motive. But those innovations have been adopted by countries that that don't have a profit motive. And so, our system feeds the health of other systems without a for profit system. We are going to reduce the number of innovations that we have and therefore reduce the quality of education. We are literally the golden goose of healthcare around the world. You rarely hear anybody going to Canada to get a sophisticated operation, or Britain. Where do they come? They come here.

Then Dr. Sider goes through another health care program that he says that we cut. I don't have time to get into it. But he also says that's a pro-life issue. In fact, it's a foreign program. It's the George W. Bush's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief and Secretary of State Pompei, who happens to be a Christian, by the way, announced that the program had saved the lives of more than 17 million people around the world, but Bush wanted to cut it. And so, he said, this, too, is a pro-life issue.

Here's another question. This goes back to the responsibility of government, or the primary responsibility. Is the US obligated to continue providing the same budget, or any budget, to the same programs every year in foreign governments? And how do you know that the money that you were sending to this program wouldn't help more people, say, if it was given back to the taxpayer, or spent in a program that saves even more lives? You see, the budget is not unlimited. You always have to make choices when it comes to government budgets. You can't fund everything, although currently you think we could just print money. That's what we're doing now, because of this pandemic, which has gotten so far out of hand. Don't get me started on that. But in any event, the budget is not unlimited. Moreover, removing or changing assistance is not the same moral front as using government money to literally kill people, as the

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

democrats want to do, by their government funding of abortion. It's not the same thing, despite the fact that Dr. Sider's trying to make it the same thing.

Then he moves on to racism. He says, "for centuries, American racism has killed persons created in God's image. Slavery not only dehumanized but also killed many African-Americans. In the hundred years after Lincoln ended slavery,"... Hundreds of years? It's 150 years or so. Okay. "...racist (often evangelical) white Americans lynched thousands of African-Americans." That's true. I don't know how many, but true to the shame of evangelicals. Read your Bible. Learn how to interpret the Bible. Slavery in the Old Testament, or in the Bible, is not the kind of slavery we had here. So, trying to use that to actually support slavery, or legitimize or justify slavery is wrong.

He goes on to say, "The widespread outrage over the murder of George Floyd by a white policeman has called attention in a new way to the fact that African-Americans are far more likely than white Americans to be killed by the police". Okay, sorry, no stats are given here because that's just demonstrably false. In 2019, there were 19 unarmed white and nine unarmed blacks killed by police and unarmed is hard to define. You know, unarmed, he had a brick. He didn't have a weapon like a traditional weapon, but he had a brick, and we still don't know if race motivated the horrific George Floyd incident. We don't know. We haven't had a trial. We haven't had any statements yet. We haven't had any findings of fact yet. More on this right after the break. Don't go anywhere. I'm Frank Turek. We're back in just two minutes.

Ad: Friends, Frank Turek here. I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, is a listener supported radio program and podcast, so if you like what you hear here, would you consider donating to CrossExamined.org? 100% of your donations go to ministry, zero percent to buildings. We're completely virtual. So, if you can help us out, we greatly appreciate it. Thank you so much.

We're talking about, Does Abortion Trump Everything Else, article by Ron Sider on his blog. You can go check it out, because we're going through it, considering it and critiquing it. And we were, just before the break, talking about the issue of racism that he brought up. And he doesn't give any stats that black men are killed at a higher rate by cops than white men are, because actually, the stats as of 2019 are reversed. You have 19 versus nine as a difference in

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

population, but these are very small numbers. Anyway, I will certainly agree that it's probably true that blacks are pulled over more by cops, and probably harassed more. I bet that is true. I don't have stats on it. But anecdotally, I think that would be true. But when it comes to murder, I don't think that's the case. In fact, the stats say that otherwise, and we want to root out racism everywhere we can.

But the current idea that we're going to defund the police, as we talked about on several shows ago, is literally crazy. You do not shut down all police because you find a few who are bad, just like you do not shut down all doctors because you find a few that commit malpractice. That's crazy. And go to that previous podcast to unpack that, to hear us unpack that a little bit further. I just want to keep moving here on this issue right now, because what Dr. Sider goes on to say, he says, "And one tragic fact about the current pandemic is that African-Americans are twice as likely to die of COVID-19 as white Americans. Tragically, President Trump continues to stoke racism rather than lead the nation to end it."

Okay, this is a very dire charge. What evidence do you have for that? What do you mean by stoking racism? And how is the president responsible for how different ethnic groups respond to a virus? I mean, if you want the identity politics party, that's the Democratic Party. Everyone is divided by a group because America is inherently unfair and divided, according to the democrat party, that everybody needs to be put in a particular category; white, black, Hispanic, Native American, gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, create your own gender, whatever, rich, poor, etc. They've got all of these categories. You can't have a United States if you keep dividing people up by these categories. Everybody's an American made in the likeness and image of God and everybody ought to be treated with respect.

He goes on to say, "combating and ending racism is a pro-life issue". It is. The most racist act we need to end is abortion. More blacks are killed by abortion than all other deaths combined. In fact, Walt Blackman, a black gentleman himself, from the Arizona State Congress, wrote this in a recent article. He said, and this is the latest stats he had, according to the Guttmacher Institute, which generally supports abortion. "In 2011, 360,000 black babies were aborted. CDC statistics for 2011 showed that 287,000 black deaths occurred from all other causes excluding abortion. By these numbers, abortion is the leading cause of death among blacks."

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

That's what's going on. Black lives do matter. Why don't they matter in the womb? That's where most blacks are being killed. More blacks are killed in the womb than die in America, according to this. You want to end racial inequity? One way you can end it, if you think it's systematic, stop paying women to have children out of wedlock. Pay them for marriage instead. Now that's a hard problem. You wouldn't be able to just stop payments right away. You'd have to gradually phase that out and require marriage rather than giving people money to have children out of wedlock. And also, another way you can end it is to provide school choice. Because kids in poor neighborhoods don't have the same opportunities that kids in rich neighborhoods have. But guess what? The democrat party's against that. They are for choice if the choice includes dismembering a child in the womb. They're against choice if it comes to educating a child who survives the womb. Now, how is that consistent?

Dr. Sider then goes on to talk about smoking. I don't know why he brings smoking up because we stopped subsidizing tobacco in 2004. And who stopped that? George W. Bush. So, why is he even bringing this up? This is a dead issue. And there's no difference between Trump and Biden on this. Neither of them, as to my knowledge, want to support tobacco. In fact, Trump personally, you know, he doesn't smoke. He doesn't drink. You think he was he was some sort of fundamentalist evangelical. And he tells his kids, don't do that either. So, he's not for that either.

And I agree we shouldn't be supporting tobacco or smoking. I've been an anti-smoker most of my life. My dad smoked growing up. I hated it. I was always worried that he was gonna get lung cancer. Another cancer took him out, as you know, a couple of months ago, but he was 84 years old. But again, it's a failure to make moral distinctions to suggest that farm subsidies, which we don't do anymore for this, and smoking, are equivalent to giving subsidies to directly kill unborn people in the womb. It's a failure to make distinctions.

Then he goes on to talk about climate change, as if climate change is a pro-life issue, combating global warming is a pro-life issue, he says. He says it's the overwhelming scientific consensus. Let me ask you this question. Is failing to reduce global emissions, to a level you suggest, just as bad as paying for or allowing the murder of millions of innocent babies this year? Now we can argue over climate change all day. But I have a couple of questions. Why were there dramatic shifts in climate before human beings had any CO2 emissions? Why did we have ice ages and

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

warm ages long before there was any global emission? Why did we have that? And again, this is not only a failure to understand a moral hierarchy, it's also a failure to anticipate unintended consequences or the ripple effect. I mean, even if even if he's right about manmade climate change and all, the dire predictions so far have been wrong.

You remember 20 years ago, everyone said we'd be dead by now, and we're not. Okay? The United States could cut its emissions to zero, and it would have virtually no effect on global temperatures, even if their models are right. Why? Because countries such as China and India put out far more CO₂ than us and they will not reduce them enough. I have a friend, actually he's related. He's married to my wife's cousin out there in Geneva, Switzerland. We were out there about 10 years ago, and we were talking about climate change. He worked for the UN. He says, Frank, what do you think about climate change? Don't you think we ought to reduce global emissions? The US ought to do it? I said, look, even if they're right about this, the United States could reduce its global emissions to zero and it wouldn't have hardly any effect, because China, India, other developing countries just keep polluting. And he said, you know what? You're right. That's the fact. Moreover, what is often forgotten is that those emissions are the product of productivity and jobs, including food, healthcare, manufacturing housing. They probably save far more lives than any reduction in global temperatures would. In other words, shutting down CO₂ emissions will probably kill more people than allowing them to continue the same.

The same thing happened with DDT. You remember DDT, which was a pesticide that would kill mosquitoes and we banned it because we thought it might also cause cancer. Well, as soon as we banned it, what happened? We couldn't reduce the number of mosquitoes and more people died from malaria than would ever die from cancer.

Look, there are very few perfect solutions in society. Quite frankly, there are tradeoffs. You're not understanding that there are unintended consequences. And if you stop one thing, it ripples forward to start another thing. Or if you start one thing, it ripples forward to end another thing. The COVID lockdown is a prime example. No matter what you do, there are unintended consequences. Sometimes the cure is worse than the disease. You have suicides up. Obviously, people have lost their businesses, their livelihood, their ability to meet with others, and you know, they're depressed and they're sick, and there's stress. And Walmart can stay

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

open, but the mom and pop shop can't. There are unintended consequences. Maybe they're intended. Everything is connected. So, in my opinion, this article exhibits very poor systematic thinking by Dr. Sider. He not only doesn't understand there's a moral hierarchy, he doesn't understand, it seems, that if you try and change one thing, it affects something else down the road, which might be worse than what you're trying to fix. The cure might be worse than the disease.

Then, of course, he talks about capital punishment. Of course, there's a big difference between killing a guilty murderer and an innocent baby, but he doesn't seem to make that distinction. He ignores the fact that capital punishment is supported in the Old Testament and even the New Testament. Jesus affirmed capital punishment when Pilate said, don't you know I have the authority to kill you? And Jesus said, yeah, you do, but you get that authority from above.

And he goes on, he tries to, I don't have time to read the whole thing. We're running out of time here. You can read it on your own, but he tries to say that, ;let's suppose that Donald Trump wins in September. Well, first of all, let me commend Dr. Sider for pointing out that Joe Biden is wrong on the abortion issue. He agrees with that. But he goes on to say this. "But let's suppose that Donald Trump wins in November 3, appoints one or two more "pro-life" persons to the Supreme Court and the high court proceeds to overturn Roe vs Wade. Would that end abortion in America? Not a chance! The 79% of Americans who want abortion to be legal will vote to make that happen."

Well, he's right. Some states will keep it legal, but others won't. You know, like Mississippi probably won't keep it legal. South Dakota probably won't keep it legal, except for certain circumstances. So, it will still save thousands of lives. And then he goes on to say that, basically, that means that the basis of the most realistic projection of what Trump's re-election would mean on abortion that not a lot would substantially change. Yeah, unless you define saving thousands of lives each year not substantial. Yeah, you wouldn't rule it out completely. Overturning Roe v Wade does not make abortion illegal across the country. It just sends it back to the States. That's true. But some states will restrict it, as Sider admits, and saving some lives is better than saving none.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

Let me sum all this up this way. Does abortion Trump everything else? Well, let's change the title to reflect reality a little bit; Does Murder Trump Everything Else? The answer is yes. So, being pro-life on abortion doesn't necessarily mean you're a good candidate but being pro-abortion necessarily means you're a bad candidate. Being pro-life on abortion doesn't necessarily qualify you morally to be president. But being pro-abortion necessarily disqualifies you morally to be President. I mean, you can be pro-life and be a knucklehead on many issues, okay. It doesn't mean you're going to be a good president. But being pro-abortion, in my view, disqualifies you because you are neglecting the weightier matters of the law.

Now, we'll look at -arty platforms in a later program. We'll have Dr. Michael Brown, who wrote a new book on this on. Let me say this, let me echo what my friend Charlie Kirk said. He said, "when you're electing somebody, you're not merely electing a person, you're electing a worldview". Are you willing to say that I'm okay with a million babies dead per year because I don't like President Trump's tone? Is that what you're saying? I don't think that's gonna fly in front of Jesus, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Frank Turek. Talk to you next week. God bless.

Ad: If you benefit from this podcast, help others find it. Just go to iTunes, or any other podcast service you might be using to listen and leave us a five-star rating on the, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, podcast with Dr. Frank Turek. It will take you less than five seconds. You can also help a lot by leaving us a positive review for others to see. This podcast is available on iTunes, Spotify, Google Play, Stitcher, TuneIn, and many other audio content delivery apps. Thank you and God bless.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



[CLICK HERE TO LISTEN TO THIS PODCAST](#)